TRIDENT TECHNICAL COLLEGE
SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR 2005-2006

Trident Technical College's vision is to be a leader among two-year colleges in providing diverse and innovative educational programs and services in a highly technical and competitive global environment. College policy 2-18-0 titled Vision Statement, Mission Statement, Institutional Values, Institutional Goals and Objectives refers to the college's commitment to technical and comprehensive education to enhance economic development. The Policies and Procedures can be found at http://www.tridenttech.edu/261.htm

This summary report for Trident Technical College includes the following Institutional Effectiveness components: Majors and Concentrations, General Education and Success of Transfer Students.

METHODOLOGY-Academic Programs. In 2004 – 2005 Trident Technical College implemented Curriculum Assessment Plans, a program evaluation process which includes assessing student learning outcomes and an analysis of indicators of program health (vital statistics). Each associate degree program is evaluated on a two year cycle. The first year of the cycle includes designing the student learning outcomes and collecting the data necessary for the assessment. At the end of the first year Program Managers review student learning outcome data and create plans to improve performance on those outcomes that fall below expected performance levels. In the second year of the cycle the plans for improvement are implemented. Vital Statistics are compared and reviewed annually.

A Student Learning Outcome Assessment consists of:

- **Student Learning Outcomes** – a definition of what graduates should be able to do
- **Where Outcomes are Assessed** - a description of the course, clinic or lab where student learning is assessed
- **Methods for Outcomes Assessment** – a description of the methodology used for assessing student learning outcomes
- **Expected Level of Program Performance** - specification of the expected levels of program performance for each outcome (expected outcomes)
- **Data Collection** - a description of what, how and when data will be collected
- **Results** - a description of the actual results of the assessment
- **Use of Results** - a description of how the results will be used to improve the instructional program
- **Vital Statistics** – include Fall Enrollment, Job Placement or Transfer Rate, Student Satisfaction with Instruction, Number of Graduates, Employer Satisfaction with Graduates, and Licensure/Certification Pass Rates.

In addition to the CAP each instructional program undergoes the annual SBTCE Program Evaluation process. The SBTCE criteria includes Fall FTE and headcount by program for associate degrees, diplomas and certificates, number of graduates by program, and job placement by program. Please note that three of the four SBTCE criteria are included in Vital Statistics.

The assessment cycle for academic program evaluations is presented in the following table.

2-year Curriculum Assessment Cycle

Planning Cycle	Academic Years	Activities	Time Frame	Report	Report due
2004 - 2006	2004-2005	Plan for Assessment	Aug - Sep 2004	2004 - 2006 CAP Planning Stages (Columns A-E)	Sep 2004
		Collect Data	Sep 2004 – Aug 2005	2004 - 2006 CAP Report (Column F)	Sep 2005
		Plan for Improvement	Aug – Sep 2005	2004 – 2006 CAP Report (Column G)	Sep 2005
	2005-2006	Implement Improvement Plans	Sep 2005 – Aug 2006	2004 – 2006 Assessment Summary (Cover Sheet)	Sep 2006
2006 - 2008	2006-2007	Plan for Assessment	Aug - Sep 2006	2006 - 2008 CAP Planning Stages (Columns A-E)	Sep 2006
		Collect Data	Sep 2006 – Aug 2007	2006-2008 CAP Report (Column F)	Sep 2007
		Plan for Improvement	Aug – Sep 2007	2006 – 2008 CAP Report (Column G)	Sep 2007
	2007-2008	Implement Improvement Plans	Sep 2007 – Aug 2008	2006 – 2008 Assessment Summary (Cover Sheet)	Sep 2008

FUTURE REPORTS (2006-2009). The following table presents the reporting dates for assessing Institutional Effectiveness Components from 2006 through 2011.

Institutional Effectiveness Components	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**
General Education (Every 4 years)	**X**				**X**	
Majors and Concentrations (Annual)	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**
Academic Advising (Every 4 years)			**X**			
Success of Transfer Students (Every 2yrs)	**X**		**X**		**X**	
Student Development (Every 4 years)		**X**				**X**
Library Resources (Every 4 years)				**X**		
Alumni and Placement (Every 2 years)		**X**		**X**		**X**
Total Components	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**

The following section presents a brief summary of the status of each program and service assessed in 2005 – 2006 and projected reporting dates for those components not reported this year.

GENERAL EDUCATION. TTC's general education core curriculum is the set of courses in each associate degree designed to foster problem solving and communication skills that are not specifically tailored to a professional or technical application. With a distribution of hours across six categories, the general education core curriculum ensures breadth of knowledge and exposure to a variety of ways of comprehending and analyzing knowledge.

TTC has identified core competencies for all associate degree graduates as follows:

> *Students who successfully complete an associate degree program at TTC should be able to draw on knowledge from a broad range of disciplines to make decisions and perform tasks working individually or as a member of a team in a selected academic or career pursuit using the following skills:*
>
> 1. *Communication Skills*
>   *The student should be able to communicate clearly and effectively in a variety of symbolic ways, including written, oral, mathematical, graphic and computer-based modes.*
> 2. *Problem-solving Skills*
>   *The student should be able to formulate and analyze a variety of problems – personal, interpersonal cultural, societal, academic and professional – and develop solutions.*

In 2005-2006 the general education core curriculum is being evaluated with a new approach: the analysis of student learning outcomes. A team of trained faculty members, using rubrics developed by general education faculty leaders, has analyzed samples of student work (artifacts) from upper-level courses in a wide variety of disciplines.

Key Findings. The team found that the number of artifacts was much lower than expected, and the artifacts collected were not all in a format appropriate for this type assessment. The General Education Assessment Team has examined the results and made recommendations for the addition of new measures of student learning to be added in 2006-2007.

Plan for Improvement. The team proposed a number of improvements to the assessment for the next cycle:

1. Collection of artifacts year round, instead of spring semester only.

2. Revision of the Employer Follow-Up Survey to include questions about graduates' communication and problem-solving skills. Responses to these questions will be part of the next Gen Ed assessment.

3. Use of evaluations clinical and field experience supervisors.

Implementation. The current status of the implementation plan is:

1. Artifact collection has begun

2. Employer Follow-Up Survey has been revised, and the new survey will be administered spring 2006

3. Team members are polling the divisions to determine which courses include evaluations of students by clinical supervisors and whether communication and problem solving skills are among the characteristics assessed.

MAJORS AND CONCENTRATIONS. Thirty–two associate degree programs were evaluated during the 2004-2006 assessment cycle. The first year of the assessment cycle (2004-2005) resulted in improvement plans for changes in curriculum, learning assessments, and student advisement/interaction.

Curriculum changes:

- Development of new courses
- Changes to course sequencing
- Development of new course content
- Changes to course content sequencing

Assessment changes:

- Development of new assessment methods
    - Pre- and post-testing
    - Surveys
    - Assessment matrices
- Modification of existing assessment methods

Student Advisement/Interaction changes:

- Creation of advising handouts
- Development of curriculum-related student activities
- Creation of new faculty/student discussion opportunities

During the second year of the cycle program managers implemented the improvement plans. Program managers will report the results of the implementation in September 2006.

ACADEMIC ADVISING. This component will be assessed in 2007-2008.

ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS TRANSFERRING FROM TWO- TO FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS. TTC gauges transfer activity and performance of students transferring from Trident to senior colleges by comparing: the size of transfer cohorts across time; the number of students transferring to senior colleges; and each cohort's average GPA (for the fall term of transfer) compared with that of native students.

Cohort Size. The Fall 2005 transfer cohort (those who actually enrolled and completed the Fall 2003 term at a South Carolina, public, senior institution) consists of 314 students, one student less than the Fall 2003 cohort of 315 students.

Receiving Institutions. The proportion of the Fall 2005 cohort transfers to the Citadel (7 percent) is about one percent more than in 2003 while the College of Charleston (51 percent) is 13 percent less than 2003. For the first time, the Transfer cohort includes students who transferred to MUSC. Eleven percent of the cohort transferred to MUSC. Table 1 presents the percent of the Fall 2005 Transfer Cohort who transferred to local public colleges since 1999.

Table 1

Fall Cohort	Local Public Institutions	Percent of Total Cohort
1999	College of Charleston Citadel	87%
2001	College of Charleston Citadel	69%
2003	College of Charleston Citadel	70%
2005	College of Charleston Citadel	58%
2005	College of Charleston Citadel MUSC	69%

Even though the cohort size changed by only one student, an analysis of Table 1 indicates that the percent of students transferring to local public institutions is decreasing. At the same time, data indicates a larger percent of the cohort are transferring to public colleges located elsewhere in the state. There were decreases in the number of transfers to the USC Upstate, College of Charleston, Francis Marion University, and Winthrop University. However, there were increases in the number of students transferring to Clemson University, The Citadel, USC Columbia, South Carolina State University, Lander, MUSC and USC Beaufort.

Table 2 presents the number of transfers, percent of cohort and the percent change from 2003 to 2005 for each public college in the state.

Table 2

Enrolled	2003	% of Cohort	2005	% of Cohort	% change
Clemson University	18	5.71%	21	6.69%	16.7%
Coastal Carolina University	7	2.22%	7	2.23%	0.0%
College of Charleston	202	64.13%	161	51.27%	-20.3%
Francis Marion University	4	1.27%	0	0.00%	-100.0%
Lander	2	0.63%	3	0.96%	50.0%
MUSC	0	0.00%	33	10.51%	100.0%
South Carolina State University	9	2.86%	15	4.78%	66.7%
The Citadel	19	6.03%	22	7.01%	15.8%
USC Aiken	1	0.32%	1	0.32%	0.0%
USC Beaufort	0	0.00%	1	0.32%	100.0%
USC Columbia	31	9.84%	39	12.42%	25.8%
USC Upstate	5	1.59%	3	0.96%	-40.0%
Winthrop University	17	5.40%	8	2.55%	-52.9%
	315	100.00%	314	100.00%	

Fall Term GPAs. The 2005 data provide an average GPA for those students who transferred and completed 0 to 29 hours, 30 to 59 hours, or 60 or more hours. Analysis of individual student performance is not possible. In fact, the 2005 transfer data limits analysis and does not allow for meaningful comparison between transfer and native students.

The available data does allow a comparison of average GPAs across the three categories of credit hours transferred and earned. Table 3 presents the number of students transferring to each college and their average GPA compared to the native students and their average GPA for each public senior institution.

TABLE 3

Senior College	Trident Technical College Transfer Students' Fall 2005 Average GPA		Senior Institution First Time Native Students' Fall 2005 Average GPA		Difference in GPA Senior Native minus Trident Transfer
	Students	***AVG. GPA***	***Students***	***AVG. GPA***	
The Citadel	22	3.15	1921	2.60	(.55)
Clemson	21	1.99	13223	2.88	.89
College of Charleston	158	2.76	6621	2.97	.21
Coastal Carolina	7	3.06	3713	2.82	(.24)
Francis Marion	No data				
Lander	3	2.24	1668	2.56	.32
South Carolina State	15	2.06	2804	2.68	.62
USC – Aiken	1	2.19	2609	2.58	.39
USC – Columbia	39	2.86	16421	2.88	.02
USC – Upstate	3	1.71	3661	2.57	.86)
Winthrop	8	2.87	4132	2.64	(.23)
Total					

Table 1 indicates students transferring to The Citadel, College of Charleston, Coastal Carolina, Francis Marion, South Carolina State, USC – Aiken, USC – Columbia, and Winthrop established an average GPA at or above 2.00. Trident Transfer students' average GPA was higher than native students GPAs at The Citadel, Coastal Carolina and Winthrop. Considering the vast differences in the numbers of students, the differences between Trident Transfer students and Native students appear to be miniscule.

The range of Trident Transfer students' average GPA is 1.71 to 3.14 compared to the Native students' average GPA range of 2.56 to 2.97.

Unfortunately, the lack of detail in transfer data limits further analysis. The results of this analysis offer little or no direction for drawing conclusions or designing improvement strategies.

LIBRARY RESOURCES. This component will be assessed in 2008-2009.

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT. This component will be assessed in 2006-2007.